

Todd M. Friedman (216752)  
Adrian R. Bacon (280332)  
**Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C.**  
324 S. Beverly Dr. #725  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Phone: (877) 206-4741  
Fax: (866)633-0228  
tfriedman@attorneysforconsumers.com  
abacon@attorneysforconsumers.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs,*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RONALD RAMOS, on behalf of himself and ) all others similarly situated, ) Plaintiff, ) vs. ) YURZ, INC., and DOES 1 through 10, ) inclusive, and each of them, ) Defendants. )	Case No. <u>'16CV0375 DMS DHB</u>  <b><u>CLASS ACTION</u></b>  <b>COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF:</b>  1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET SEQ.] 2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET SEQ.]  <b><u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u></b>
--	---

Plaintiff, RONALD RAMOS ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon personal knowledge:

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

1. Plaintiff brings this action for himself and others similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from the illegal actions of YURZ, INC. ("Defendant"), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy.

**JURISDICTION & VENUE**

2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 *U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)* because Plaintiff, a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a company with its principal place of business and State of Incorporation in California. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each call in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in the thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction. Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”) are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.

3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California pursuant to 18 *U.S.C. § 1391(b)* and 18 *U.S.C. § 1441(a)* because Defendant does business within the state of California and Plaintiff resides within this District.

**PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff, RONALD RAMOS (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person residing in San Marcos, California and is a “person” as defined by 47 *U.S.C. § 153 (10)*.

5. Defendant, YURZ, INC. (“Defendant” or “DEFENDANT”), is an internet marketing company and is a “person” as defined by 47 *U.S.C. § 153 (10)*.

6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are collectively referred to as “Defendants.” The true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants

1 when such identities become known.

2 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and every  
3 Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and was  
4 acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge  
5 and consent of each of the other Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the  
6 acts and/or omissions complained of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the  
7 other Defendants.  
8

9 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10 8. Beginning in or around August of 2015, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on his  
11 cellular telephone, 760-239-1554, in an effort to sell or solicit its services.  
12

13 9. Defendant used an “automatic telephone dialing system”, as defined by 47  
14 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its daily calls to Plaintiff seeking to sell or solicit its business  
15 services, with calls originating from the number 800 701-1702.

16 10. Defendant’s calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as  
17 defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).  
18

19 11. Defendant’s calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a cellular  
20 telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §  
21 227(b)(1).  
22

23 12. Plaintiff is not a customer of Defendant’s services and has never provided any  
24 personal information, including his cellular telephone number, to Defendant for any purpose  
25 whatsoever. Accordingly, Defendant never received Plaintiff’s “prior express consent” to  
26 receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice  
27 on his cellular telephone pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).  
28

**CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

13. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, as a member of the proposed class (hereafter “The Class”) defined as follows:

All persons within the United States who received any telephone calls from Defendant to said person’s cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously consented to receiving such calls within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint

14. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of All persons within the United States who received any telephone calls from Defendant to said person’s cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone number to Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

15. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the Class members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

16. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that The Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Class members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

17. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at

1 least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff and Class members via their  
2 cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and Class members to incur certain charges or  
3 reduced telephone time for which Plaintiff and Class members had previously paid by having to  
4 retrieve or administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the  
5 privacy of said Plaintiff and Class members.

6  
7 18. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The Class which  
8 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of The Class. These  
9 common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between Class members, and which  
10 may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any Class members,  
11 include, but are not limited to, the following:  
12

- 13 a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,  
14 Defendant made any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes  
15 or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class  
16 member using any automatic telephone dialing system or any artificial or  
17 prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular  
18 telephone service;  
19 b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damages thereby, and the  
20 extent of damages for such violation; and  
21 c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in  
22 the future.

23 19. As a person that received numerous calls from Defendant using an automatic  
24 telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express  
25 consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The Class.

26 20. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of The  
27 Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions.

28 21. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and efficient  
adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Class members  
is impracticable. Even if every Class member could afford individual litigation, the court

1 system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation  
2 of numerous issues would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential  
3 for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense  
4 to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual  
5 issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer management  
6 difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the  
7 rights of each Class member.  
8

9 22. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create a  
10 risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the  
11 interests of the other Class members not parties to such adjudications or that would  
12 substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party Class members to protect their  
13 interests.  
14

15 23. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to The  
16 Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to the members of the  
17 California Class as a whole.  
18

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
20 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**  
21 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

22 24. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the  
23 allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-23.

24 25. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and  
25 multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of  
26 the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*

27 26. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*,  
28

1 Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for  
2 each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

3 27. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief  
4 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

5  
6 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
7 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**  
8 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

9 28. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the  
10 allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-23.

11 29. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and  
12 multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and  
13 every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

14 30. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227  
15 et seq., Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory  
16 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. §  
17 227(b)(3)(C).

18  
19 31. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief  
20 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act  
47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B); and
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act  
47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C); and
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted this 1st Day of February, 2016.

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s Todd M. Friedman  
Todd M. Friedman  
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman  
Attorney for Plaintiff